

GORDON H. DePAOLI  
Nevada State Bar No. 00195  
DALE E. FERGUSON  
Nevada State Bar No.4986  
WOODBURN AND WEDGE  
6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
Reno, Nevada 89511  
Telephone: 775 / 688-3000

6 Attorneys for WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION  
7 DISTRICT

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Pursuant to the Court's relevant Orders, counsel for the United States, the Walker River Paiute Tribe, Mineral County, the Walker Lake Working Group, Nevada, California, Landolts, Circle Bar N Ranch, LLC, et al., and Walker River Irrigation District have met in an effort to

1 agree upon the threshold issues to be considered in accordance with the Case Management  
2 Order. They have been unsuccessful in reaching such an agreement.

3 Set forth below are issues which the Nevada Department of Wildlife, Joseph and  
4 Beverly Landolt, Circle Barn N Ranch, LLC, et al., and the Walker River Irrigation District  
5 contend are appropriate for consideration as threshold issues. In submitting this list, we do not  
6 contend that all of these issues should be addressed simultaneously. We request that the Court  
7 establish a schedule pursuant to which the parties would provide argument as to why a  
8 particular issue is a threshold issue, and as to how and when the issue ought to be addressed.  
9 We suggest an initial filing of simultaneous briefs on those questions, with a period of time  
10 allowed for a simultaneous response to the initial filings, and finally with a time allowed for a  
11 simultaneous reply to the responses. Thereafter, the Court might schedule a hearing to  
12 determine the threshold issues.  
13

14

**PROPOSED THRESHOLD ISSUES**

15

1. Whether this Court has jurisdiction to adjudicate new claims for additional surface  
16 and/or underground water in Case C-125, a case in which a final judgment has been entered, or  
17 must a new and separate action form the basis for these claims; and if so, to what extent should  
18 the Court exercise its jurisdiction in these matters?

19

2. Whether a claim to a right for conservation storage of water in Weber Reservoir may be  
20 made under the implied reservation of water rights doctrine, which was established in *Winters*  
21 *v. United States*, 207 U.S. 564 (1908), or under any other theory of federal common law?

22

3. Whether a claim to a right for underground water may be made under the implied  
23 reservation of water rights doctrine, which was established in *Winters v. United States*, 207  
24 U.S. 564 (1908), or under any other theory of federal common law?

25

4. Whether the express provisions of the Walker River Decree prevent the Tribe and the  
26 United States from asserting any claim in and to the waters of the Walker River and its

1 tributaries that could have been asserted as of April 14, 1936, including a claim to a right for  
2 conservation storage?

3 5. Whether any water, surface or underground, was impliedly reserved when lands were  
4 added to the Reservation in 1936 in light of the following: (1) the language and history of the  
5 Act of Congress that authorized the addition of those lands; (2) the fact that prior to their  
6 addition to the Reservation, those lands were designated as public domain and opened to entry  
7 under the Desert Lands Act; and (3) the fact that the lands were added for grazing purposes.

8 6. Whether the United States may reserve water, under the federally implied reservation of  
9 water doctrine, from a water source that is not within the lands being reserved?

10 7. Whether the doctrine of claim (res judicata) and/or issue preclusion (collateral estoppel)  
11 bar any claim for:

12 a. federally reserved surface water rights for the lands added to the Reservation as  
13 a result of the 1936 legislation ("1936 Lands");

14 b. additional water from an underground source for lands that were within the  
15 Reservation at the time the Walker River Decree was entered;

16 c. additional water from an underground source for the 1936 Lands;

17 d. storage rights, other than those for regulatory purposes, for those lands that were  
18 within the Reservation at the time the Walker River Decree was entered; and

19 e. storage rights, other than those for regulatory purposes, for the 1936 Lands.

20 8. Whether the doctrine of laches may be asserted against the counterclaims filed by the  
21 United States and Tribe?

22 a. Whether the doctrine of laches bars the conservation storage claims of the  
23 United States and the Tribe for the lands within the Reservation as it existed at the time of entry  
24 of the Walker River Decree?

1           b.     Whether the doctrine of laches bars the United States' and the Tribe's claims for  
2 a water right from underground sources for the Reservation as it existed at the time of the entry  
3 of the Walker River Decree?

4           c.     Whether the doctrine of laches bars the United States' and Tribe's claims for  
5 federally reserved water rights including surface water, underground water, and/or conservation  
6 storage claims for the 1936 Lands?

7           9.     Whether other equitable defenses bar some or all of the said Tribal Claims?

8           a.     Whether the doctrine of estoppel bars:

9               (1)   any claim for a water right from underground sources within the  
10 Reservation as it existed at the time of entry of the Walker River Decree;

11              (2)   any claim for a water right from underground sources within the 1936  
12 Lands;

13              (3)   any claim for conservation storage water rights for use on lands within  
14 the Reservation as it existed at the time of entry of the Walker River Decree; and

15              (4)   any claim for conservation storage water rights for use on the 1936  
16 Lands.

17           b.     Whether the Defendants may assert detrimental reliance as a defense to the  
18 counterclaims of the United States and the Tribe?

19           c.     Whether past actions by the Tribe and/or the United States, with regard to the  
20 use of water and the allowance of waste, are sufficient to bar equitable relief?

21           10.    Whether through its commencement and resolution of claims against the United States,  
22 the Tribe's claims (a) for water from underground sources, (b) for a conservation storage water  
23 right for Weber Reservoir, and/or (c) for a implied reserved water right for the 1936 Lands  
24 have been waived and are therefore extinguished?

1       11. If the Tribe has no claim to underground water on the Reservation based upon the  
2 implied reservation of water doctrine, or based upon any other theory of federal common law,  
3 does the State of Nevada have jurisdiction to regulate the use of underground water on the  
4 Reservation? Should the court decide this question?

6           12. Whether, regardless of the extent of hydrologic connection between surface and  
7           underground water, this court is required to accept the distinction drawn between surface water  
8           rights and groundwater rights provided by California and Nevada law?

9       13. Are the holders of surface water rights established under federal law entitled to  
10 protection from the use of underground water beyond the protection provided to holders of  
11 surface water rights established under state law?

DATED this 24th day of June, 2008.

14 By: Marta Adams  
15 Marta Adams  
16 Sr. Deputy Attorney General  
17 Conservation, Natural Resources  
18 100 North Carson Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
Attorneys for NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF  
WILDLIFE

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Laura Schroeder  
Schroeder Law Offices  
1915 N.E. 39th Avenue  
P.O. Box 12527  
Portland, Oregon 97212-0527  
Attorneys for CIRCLE BAR N RANCH,  
LLC, et al.

20 By: \_\_\_\_\_ Gordon H. DePaoli  
21 By: \_\_\_\_\_ Dale E. Ferguson  
John W. Howard Woodburn and Wedge  
1508 West Lewis Street 6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
San Diego, California 92103 Reno, Nevada 89511  
22 Attorneys for JOSEPH AND BEVERLY Attorneys for WALKER RIVER  
23 LANDOLT IRRIGATION DISTRICT

1 11. If the Tribe has no claim to underground water on the Reservation based upon the  
2 implied reservation of water doctrine; or based upon any other theory of federal common law,  
3 does the State of Nevada have jurisdiction to regulate the use of underground water on the  
4 Reservation? Should the court decide this question?

5 12. Whether, regardless of the extent of hydrologic connection between surface and  
6 underground water, this court is required to accept the distinction drawn between surface water  
7 rights and groundwater rights provided by California and Nevada law?

8 13. Are the holders of surface water rights established under federal law entitled to  
9 protection from the use of underground water beyond the protection provided to holders of  
10 surface water rights established under state law?

11 DATED this 24th day of June, 2008.

12 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
13  
14  
15 Marta Adama  
16 Sr. Deputy Attorney General  
17 Conservation, Natural Resources  
18 100 North Carson Street  
19 Carson City, Nevada 89701  
20 Attorneys for NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF  
21 WILDLIFE

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Laura Schroeder  
Schroeder Law Offices  
1915 N.E. 39th Avenue  
P.O. Box 12527  
Portland, Oregon 97212-0527  
Attorneys for CIRCLE BAR N RANCH,  
LLC, et al.

22 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
23 John W. Howard  
24 1508 West Lewis Street  
San Diego, California 92103  
25 Attorneys for JOSEPH AND BEVERLY  
LANDOLT

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Gordon H. DePaoli  
Dale E. Ferguson  
Woodburn and Wedge  
6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
Reno, Nevada 89511  
Attorneys for WALKER RIVER  
IRRIGATION DISTRICT

1       11. If the Tribe has no claim to underground water on the Reservation based upon the  
2 implied reservation of water doctrine, or based upon any other theory of federal common law,  
3 does the State of Nevada have jurisdiction to regulate the use of underground water on the  
4 Reservation? Should the court decide this question?

9       13. Are the holders of surface water rights established under federal law entitled to  
10 protection from the use of underground water beyond the protection provided to holders of  
11 surface water rights established under state law?

DATED this 24th day of June, 2008.

15 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
16 Marta Adama  
17 Sr. Deputy Attorney General  
Conservation, Natural Resources  
18 100 North Carson Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
19 Attorneys for NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF  
WILDLIFE

By: Lanschord

Laura Schroeder  
Schroeder Law Offices  
1915 N.E. 39th Avenue  
P.O. Box 12527  
Portland, Oregon 97212-0527  
Attorneys for CIRCLE BAR N RANCH,  
LLC, et al.

20  
21 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
22 John W. Howard  
1508 West Lewis Street  
San Diego, California 92103  
23 Attorneys for JOSEPH AND BEVERLY  
24 LANDOLT

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Gordon H. DePaoli  
Dale E. Ferguson  
Woodburn and Wedge  
6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
Reno, Nevada 89511  
Attorneys for WALKER RIVER  
IRRIGATION DISTRICT

1       11. If the Tribe has no claim to underground water on the Reservation based upon the  
2 implied reservation of water doctrine, or based upon any other theory of federal common law,  
3 does the State of Nevada have jurisdiction to regulate the use of underground water on the  
4 Reservation? Should the court decide this question?

6       12. Whether, regardless of the extent of hydrologic connection between surface and  
7 underground water, this court is required to accept the distinction drawn between surface water  
8 rights and groundwater rights provided by California and Nevada law?

9       13. Are the holders of surface water rights established under federal law entitled to  
10 protection from the use of underground water beyond the protection provided to holders of  
11 surface water rights established under state law?

DATED this 24th day of June, 2008.

15 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
16 Marta Adams  
17 Sr. Deputy Attorney General  
18 Conservation, Natural Resources  
100 North Carson Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
19 Attorneys for NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF  
20 WILDLIFE

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Laura Schroeder  
Schroeder Law Offices  
1915 N.E. 39th Avenue  
P.O. Box 12527  
Portland, Oregon 97212-0527  
Attorneys for CIRCLE BAR N RANCH,  
LLC, et al.

21 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
22 John W. Howard  
23 1508 West Lewis Street  
San Diego, California 92103  
24 Attorneys for JOSEPH AND BEVERLY  
LANDOLT

Dale E. Ferguson  
Woodburn and Wedge  
6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
Reno, Nevada 89511  
Attorneys for WALKER RIVER  
IRRIGATION DISTRICT

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of Woodburn and Wedge and that on the 24th day of June, 2008, I electronically served the foregoing *Proposed Threshold Issues Submitted by Nevada Department of Wildlife, Joseph and Beverly Landolt, Circle Bar N Ranch, LLC, et al., and Walker River Irrigation District* on the following via their email addresses:

Linda Ackley  
lackley@water.ca.gov

Marta Adams  
maadams@ag.state.nv.us, payoung@ag.state.nv.us

Greg Addington  
greg.addington@usdoj.gov, judy.farmer@usdoj.gov, joanie.silvershield@usdoj.gov

George Benesch  
gbenesch@sbcglobal.net

Karen Peterson  
kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com, jjonas@allisonmackenzie.com

Simeon Herskovits  
herskovitx@westernlaw.org

John W. Howard  
johnh@jhowardattorneys.com, elisam@jhowardattorneys.com

Michael D. Hoy  
Michael D Hoy mhoy@nevadalaw.com

Erin K.L. Mahaney  
emahaney@waterboards.ca.gov

David L. Negri  
david.negri@usdoj.gov

Michael W. Neville  
michael.neville@doj.ca.gov, wallace.greene@doj.ca.gov

Susan Schneider  
susan.schneider@usdoj.gov

Laura Schroeder  
counsel@water-law.com

1 Stacey Simon  
2 ssimon@mono.ca.gov

3 Wes Williams  
4 wwilliams@standfordaluni.org

5 and I further certify that I served a copy of the foregoing to the following by U.S. Mail, postage  
6 prepaid, this 24th day of June, 2008:

7 Kenneth Spooner  
8 General Manager  
9 Walker River Irrigation District  
P.O. Box 820  
Yerington, NV 89447

William W. Quinn  
Office of the Field Solicitor  
Department of the Interior  
401 W. Washington St., SPC 44  
Phoenix, AZ 85003

10 Mary Hackenbracht  
11 Deputy Attorney General  
12 State of California  
13 1515 Clay St., 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612-1413

Tracy Taylor  
Division of Water Resources  
State of Nevada  
901 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89701

14 Garry Stone  
United States District Court Water Master  
15 290 S. Arlington Ave., 3rd Floor  
16 Reno, NV 89501

Allen Biaggi  
Dir. of Conservation & Natural Resources  
State of Nevada  
901 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89701

17 John Kramer  
18 Dept. of Water Resources  
19 1416 Ninth St.  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Wesley G. Beverlin  
Malissa Hathaway McKeith  
Lewis, Brisbois, Bisgaard & Smith LCP  
221 N. Figueroa St., Suite 1200  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

20 James Shaw  
21 Water Master  
22 U.S. Board of Water Commissioners  
P.O. Box 853  
23 Yerington, NV 89447

Robert L. Auer  
Lyon County District Attorney  
31 S. Main St.  
Yerington, NV 89447

24 Tim Glidden  
25 U. S. Dept. of the Interior, Office of the  
Secretary, Div. Of Indian Affairs  
1849 C St. N.W.  
26 Mail Stop 6456  
Washington, D.C. 20240

Cheri Emm-Smith  
Mineral County District Attorney  
P. O. Box 1210  
Hawthorne, NV 89415

1 Marshall S. Rudolph, Mono County Counsel William E. Schaeffer  
2 Stacy Simon, Deputy County Counsel P. O. Box 936  
Mono County Battle Mountain, NV 89820  
3 P. O. Box 2415  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546-2415

4 Todd Plimpton Nathan Goedde, Staff Counsel  
5 Belanger & Plimpton California Dept. of Fish and Game  
1135 Central Ave. 1416 Ninth St., #1335  
6 P.O. Box 59 Sacramento, CA 95814  
7 Lovelock, NV 89419

8 Jeff Parker Timothy A. Lukas  
9 Deputy Atty. General P.O. Box 3237  
Office of the Attorney General Reno, NV 89505  
10 100 N. Carson St.  
Carson City, NV 89701-4717

Holly Deula

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28